	Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCI	H Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 1 of 20 Pageid#: 1024
	USA v. Jer	kins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA	
2		RLOTTESVILLE DIVISION
3	*****************	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERI	CA, CRIMINAL CASE NO.: 3:23-CR-11 NOVEMBER 13, 2024, 11:00 A.M.
5 6	Plaintiff,	CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA STATUS CONFERENCE
7	SCOTT HOWARD JENKINS,	Before:
8	SCOIL HOWARD JENKINS,	HONORABLE ROBERT S. BALLOU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9	Defendant.	WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
10	*****************	
11	APPEARANCES:	
12	For the Government:	CELIA RUTH CHOY, ESQUIRE
13	Tor ene dovernment.	LINA PENG, ESQUIRE DOJ-Crm
14		Public Integrity Section 1301 New York Avenue NW, 10th Floor
15		Washington, DC 20530 202-875-1557
16		MELANIE SMITH, ESQUIRE DOJ-USAO
17		Western District of Virginia 255 West Main Street, Suite 130
18		Charlottesville, VA 22902
19		434-293-4203
20		
21	Court Reporter: Lisa M. Blair, RPR, RMR, CRR, FOCR 255 West Main Street, Suite 304	
22	Charl	ottesville, Virginia 22902
23	434.296.9284 PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY;	
24	TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY COMPUTER.	

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Pageid#: 1025 Filed 11/14/24 Page 2 of 20 USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024 APPEARANCES CONTINUED: PHILIP ANDONIAN, ESQUIRE For the Defendant: JOSEPH P. CALEB, ESQUIRE Caleb Andonian PLLC 1100 H Street, NW, Suite 315 Washington, DC 20005 202-953-9850

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 3 of 20 Pageid#: 1026

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

(Proceedings commenced, 11:00 a.m.)

THE COURT: Let's call our case, please.

THE CLERK: United States of America versus Scott

Howard Jenkins, Case Number 3:23-cr-11.

THE COURT: Let the record reflect the government is present by its counsel. It does not appear the defendant is present, but counsel is present.

All right. So where is Mr. Jenkins?

MR. ANDONIAN: Your Honor, thank you. Our understanding was he was excused from the proceedings. I can further represent that Mr. Jenkins is on his way back to the emergency room right now. I just got a text message from him a moment ago, pursuant to his doctor's orders.

THE COURT: All right. So where are we now?

MR. ANDONIAN: Yes, Your Honor, we --

THE COURT: So let me just make the record clear. I received -- and I'm going to file under seal -- Ms. Brown, did you get the email from Mr. Andonian?

I'll file under seal the medical records that we've gotten.

MR. ANDONIAN: Very well, Your Honor. Thank you.

So we did submit the records. Your Honor, I think at this time we don't really -- in our view, we are compelled to ask for a continuance of this matter. Mr. Jenkins is still under an acute medical condition at this moment. I mean, the

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

Court read the records. I mean, his primary care doctor is not recommending that he resume trial until he is --

THE COURT: Well, it's kind of -- he is -- I'll pull it up here.

He's not real forceful. He simply says -- he says, I would recommend -- he said, I'd like to get his condition stable before I would recommend resuming or starting the trial.

But that's not our standard, right? I mean, our standard has to be -- and the Fourth Circuit has made clear -- that, you know, the medical repercussions must be serious and out of the ordinary. Now, in both the Brown and Cole case I recognize that the jury was already impaneled; jeopardy had already attached. And so the Court is in a little bit of a different position than we are presently where jeopardy hasn't attached.

MR. ANDONIAN: Correct.

THE COURT: But the impending -- you know, going forward, Brown says the impending trial must pose a substantial danger to the defendant's life or health, right?

And he had an anxiety attack, and that's what the records make clear.

MR. ANDONIAN: Your Honor, I guess our concern is that -- and I understand he was in communication with pretrial services, as well, with his blood pressure. His reading -- we received text communications between Mr. Jenkins and the

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 5 of 20 Pageid#: 1028

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

pretrial services officer. I mean, his blood pressure -- I'm not purporting to be a doctor, but it looks like it's in the acute hypertensive crisis range given where it was. And so my understanding, though, is that the treatment going forward that his doctor is prescribing and recommending includes medication that he was not previously taking that would bring that back down. But as of right now, whatever is --

THE COURT: We're not going to start our trial until tomorrow. He's going to be on medication, then, for almost 48 hours to start the trial. And so why should I continue the trial now if -- I mean, he's going to be on medication for 48 hours. And blood pressure medication typically is fairly responsive once you get it on there. And his blood pressure last night wasn't in the same range where it was this morning. Blood pressure typically rises in the morning. That's the way our Circadian rhythms work, and we're going to wake up with a higher blood pressure typically than we're going to go to bed with.

So why shouldn't -- why should I make the decision now to continue the case?

MR. ANDONIAN: I mean, Your Honor, I guess let me answer that in a couple of ways. I want to circle back to the Brown and Cole decisions. I mean, you know, those cases are appellate cases looking backward at whether or not the court abused its discretion in denying what in both cases was, you

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 6 of 20 Pageid#: 1029

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

know, multiple -- you know, a continuance request following multiple continuances that were granted after evidentiary hearings that were held, or at least that were provided as an opportunity for the defense to provide the Court with more information in the case of *Cole*.

At this stage of things, I mean, Your Honor has discretion to grant a continuance for any number of reasons, not the least of which is in the interest of justice. And we're providing a basis right now for not impaneling a jury. I mean, Mr. Jenkins is back on his way to the emergency room this morning. If we get a jury, we pick a jury, we impanel a jury and this happens again, we're talking about now being in a position where we have a jury that's seated and we're looking at another day of potential delay. I'm just throwing out scenarios here. Now we're bumping up into the window that we've been discussing in terms of availability and being able to get the trial done.

I am simply proposing that given the current state of affairs and what my understanding -- and I'm looking at nothing more than what the Court and government counsel are looking at in the medical records -- but a doctor saying he would like to allow stabilization. He wants to see him again in two weeks. I don't think it's an unreasonable request, given where we are in the proceedings, to allow that course of medical treatment to happen and to see where things are.

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

THE COURT: But if he is -- if he's put on blood pressure medication and his blood pressure medication then becomes effective, and tomorrow morning we're able to pick a jury and go because he's now on blood pressure medication -- this is a stressful event. I mean, that stress is not going to change, whether we confront it in November of 2024, January of 2025, or some other time in the future. The stress is the same any time anyone sits as a defendant in a federal criminal trial. It's a stressful event. There is no doubt about it. And if we can pick and jury and go because he's now on medication, why not do that?

MR. ANDONIAN: I think because his doctor -- and this is the only information we now have in the record, is a note in his file from his treating physician who is saying that he would recommend allowing Mr. Jenkins to stabilize over a two-week period so he can reevaluate him and figure out what, if anything, needs to be done at that time. And there is a course of treatment that has been prescribed that is happening now. I mean, I presume if the doctor believed that a 48-hour window was enough to tell whether or not he was going to be stable from whatever is going on, that he would have said something to that effect. But he specifically wants to see him at the latest in two weeks, and I think he said earlier if the need arises. That's the medical information that's before the Court right now, and that's the medical information that we're

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 8 of 20 Pageid#: 1031

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

operating under. And I don't -- there is nothing that has been put in the record to rebut or undermine or give the Court a reason to rebut or undermine his treating physician's recommendation. However it's been worded, however forceful or not it's been stated, it's a treating physician's statement in medical records that are in evidence before the Court recommending a certain course of treatment. And we're at a stage right now where we don't have to start wringing our hands wondering whether or not we've impaneled the jury and are going to have to deal with an acute issue that comes up that perhaps could have been avoided if we allowed Mr. Jenkins to undergo the recommended course of treatment from his doctor, and then make a decision what we want to do at that point.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

MR. ANDONIAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Peng, good morning.

MS. PENG: Good morning.

The government opposes the continuance. And I think, based on the record we have here today, Your Honor has all the information it needs to deny that motion.

THE COURT: And I guess here's the dilemma that we have, right? It seems to me we're faced with two different choices. I think to be able to get the trial done by the end of next week with the anticipated evidence, our window closes tomorrow is what I'm understanding from you all. And so, if

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 9 of 20 Pageid#: 1032

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

we -- if we go forward and bring a jury in and we're not able to seat it, then we're going to be continuing the trial. If we go forward and we seat the jury and then we wind up with a medical emergency, then we're pushed into other times when we have to figure out schedules at that point in time, either the week of Thanksgiving or I change everything that I've got the week after Thanksgiving and we go then; or -- I think I looked at my calendar yesterday, and I mentioned to you all the week before and the week of Martin Luther King day, I forget exactly what those dates are -- I know I've got a civil trial up here. That can be moved. So I know there's a courtroom during that time.

So those are kind of our three options. And the question is whether -- and I'm inclined to agree with you,

Ms. Peng, that we cross this bridge tomorrow morning. But I'm just thinking out loud that what do we do if he remains unstable this time tomorrow, because the one thing we do want to avoid is an interruption in the middle of the trial once jeopardy is attached, because then that creates all kinds of complications.

MS. PENG: So I think Your Honor is correct that the record supports a condition that can be easily corrected by medication. And what we have on the record -- and I just want to complete the record today -- is that he was taken to the emergency room by his wife, not by ambulance, to a hospital

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

that was at least 30 minutes away; nobody observed the brief episode, as we now know from the records, except him and he was conscious when he got to the hospital; and the emergency records also reflect that, you know, they reminded him that he was only to report if it was an emergency, and he was released by 9:50 in the morning.

And the condition that Mr. Jenkins now claims is precluding him from coming to court is a chronic condition that has been documented in his pre-bail report. He has had his high blood pressure medication that's been controlled for a number of years. And, in fact, when Mr. Jenkins was arrested in this case back in June of 2023, he reported stroke-level blood pressure, the precise words that counsel has represented to the Court that he is experiencing at this moment; and that, in fact, he had -- at the time of his arrest -- had these stroke-level blood pressure symptoms in, quote, "recent months." And we have a video clip documenting that statement by Mr. Jenkins back in June of 2023 that we can play for the Court if the Court would like to listen to that.

And the point of that is, you know, to your point, this is not a condition that is going to go away. And it's a condition that's been controlled by medication for a number of years up until this point. And in fact, I think even in that video clip Mr. Jenkins himself says that if he takes the medication that he already had, his blood pressure would come

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 11 of 20 Pageid#: 1034

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

down within 30 minutes.

And so in the government's view if, in fact, that occurs again during the course of the trial, then he would take his medication, we could have medical personnel on standby, if need be. But continuing the trial at this juncture is not going to solve what is a chronic condition that Mr. Jenkins has.

I mean, to circle back, there's a reason why cases like Brown set such a high standard for what the defendant burden has to be to establish a substantial danger. And the doctor's note in terms of a, quote, "recommendation" that he not come to court does not meet that standard. And I note Your Honor has read the cases. In Brown in particular, the defendant there had high blood pressure; and, in fact, the defendant there had a number of small strokes. And then the court still found -- the Fourth Circuit -- that that was not sufficient to meet the substantial danger standard.

Mr. Jenkins did not have a stroke. He did not have a heart attack. He was conscious for all of the day yesterday.

In fact --

THE COURT: Right. In *Brown*, really the focus was then on whether, if I remember correctly, that defendant could then recall and be able to testify and participate in his defense.

MS. PENG: Right. And there is no indication that

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 12 of 20 Pageid#: 1035

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

Mr. Jenkins here has an inability to communicate, that he has any kind of mental -- a diminishment of his mental capacities.

And I think it's worth pointing out that the other cases that have considered this issue have looked at much more severe symptoms.

In fact, I would point the Court to a 2022 case out of the Northern District of California, Nickolopoulous, where there the Court had two doctors' notes for that particular defendant saying that they needed to avoid stress due to risk of sudden cardiac attack or death. And the Court found that that was not sufficient, despite the opinions of two physicians in that case, because the opinion has to be specifically tied to the stress that trial brings, and that proceeding to trial has to cause that substantial danger.

And then *Powell* was a case from Colorado in 2012 where the defendant there had prostate cancer, had surgery scheduled for his back, and was on high doses of narcotics, including fentanyl. And even there, the court found that that was not sufficient to meet the danger standard.

And then finally I'll point the Court to Goodwin, which is a Tenth Circuit case from 1972 where defendant was ordered out of his hospital bed in order to attend trial, despite the recommendations and affidavits of physicians to the contrary because the defendant was able to still converse with his attorneys and was able to move around.

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 13 of 20 Pageid#: 1036

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

And so what we have on the record here is nowhere near the conditions that other courts have found to be sufficient to meet the defendant's burden of showing substantial danger.

And again, I think the reason why that standard is so high is because the disruption to the administration of justice and to -- the prejudice to the government, to its witnesses, and to the right of the public to continue with this trial is strong, that the defendant must come forth with evidence showing that it would be a substantial danger to their life or health.

And I think in addition to the records we have in terms of Mr. Jenkins' pre-existing medical condition, the government would like to point out that the timing of what occurred yesterday leads the government to believe that this could be part of a delay tactic on the part of Mr. Jenkins.

And we say that not lightly, including because throughout the course of this case there has been other indications that

Mr. Jenkins has wanted to delay proceeding this matter to trial, including this was a long period of delay when he was trying to obtain an attorney for the first three months of this case that the case was delayed. That included five hearings that had to be held while he looked for an attorney. There was a substantial delay in July when this trial was supposed to go forward originally that the government --

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 14 of 20 Pageid#: 1037

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

THE COURT: There was a production there. While the government objected, it also understood why the defendants needed -- the defendant needed the additional time.

MS. PENG: That's true.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And then I think, you know, more recently, yesterday I think the Court and the government and defense counsel were on the same page that we needed those medical records as soon as possible. And as the Court saw this morning, it was the government that first produced the record that I think was eventually provided to probation this morning at about 9:30. It was only after that, that the records came through. what those records show is that Mr. Jenkins was discharged from the ER -- or not even admitted, actually -- as of 9:50 yesterday morning, and he was given those discharge records by There is no indications in the records that, you that time. know, he was not conscious, that he didn't have access to his attorneys via phone, email, what have you. So the government is perplexed as to why it took, you know, 24 hours almost for any records to come through so that we could adjudicate this matter in a timely fashion, except for, of course, the jury was called in yesterday. And then, you know, yesterday we're not calling them in until tomorrow.

You know, it's concerning to the government also that defense counsel yesterday reported absolutely no contact with the defendant himself. Now that we have the records -- again,

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 15 of 20 Pageid#: 1038

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

with no indication that he ever lost the ability to communicate consciousness, what have you -- it's concerning to the government that there was no contact with the defendant for all of yesterday, and the contact was reportedly through his wife.

And, you know, I'd like to just end by saying that the government is ready to proceed to trial. The jury is coming in. We've already spent a lot of time working through the venire. And, to quote Judge Moon as he previously denied the last continuance in this case, malfeasance by a public official is an important matter, and the public has a strong interest in seeing the case resolved.

So on that, we defer to the Court on whether you would grant this continuance. Thanks.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Peng.

MR. ANDONIAN: Your Honor, may I just say one --

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. ANDONIAN: -- brief word in conclusion to that.

I take offense and would strongly object to

Ms. Peng's suggestion that this is a delay tactic or that we in

any way have been trying to keep information from the Court and

the government. We sent the medical records --

THE COURT: And I don't think it was a suggestion that counsel was doing that.

MR. ANDONIAN: Well, I heard it slightly differently, but I just want to make the record clear. We sent the medical

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 16 of 20 Pageid#: 1039

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

records from Mr. Jenkins' treating physician as soon as we got them this morning. I don't know that requiring his doctor's staff to stay awake last night and get records out the door, rather than first thing when they opened, is necessarily a reasonable expectation the government has.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But the last thing -- I just want to come back to where we are, Your Honor, which is the record evidence in this matter as to Mr. Jenkins' health is a recommendation from his treating physician that he undergo a course of treatment -whatever he's been doing before and however chronic the underlying issue might be, there is obviously a stressor that has been added with the trial. There is obviously a connection and a nexus between the stress of the trial that has taken a chronic condition and made it acute in this moment. And there is a recommendation from a physician that is in the record now that is unrebutted and unimpeached, other than with Ms. Peng's opinion that his evaluation is insufficient, that he undergo another course of treatment for a two-week period to see if it stabilizes. And we don't think it's unreasonable under the circumstances at all for the Court to exercise its discretion in finding that is a justifiable reason to continue a matter before we have impaneled the jury and before jeopardy is attached.

And the final thing I just want to note is I have concerns that I've raised as to whether or not Mr. Jenkins'

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

participation in the proceedings would be full and robust. The stress of worrying about an acute manifestation of blood pressure to the point of crisis level is not going to help him focus. It is not going to help him pay attention. It's not going to necessarily put him in a position to work with us effectively if he decides to testify, among other reasons.

So I do want to note my concern about that on the record. But I think more importantly, we have in the record a doctor's recommendation that a different course of treatment happen for a period of weeks, after which point he can evaluate Mr. Jenkins. And there is no basis to discredit that. And that, we believe, is more than enough for the Court to exercise its discretion in granting a continuance.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

All right. So at this time I'm going to deny the request to continue. We had a day, and it's my intent to start impaneling a jury tomorrow morning. This is an organic situation and organic things change.

Brown and Cole make clear that the medical repercussions of a condition must be serious and out of the ordinary. And I recognize that a hypertensive event is serious, but it's not out of the ordinary and it can be managed by way of medication. And the impending trial must pose a substantial danger to the defendant's life or death, and that's not what is being conveyed to us through the medical records

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 18 of 20 Pageid#: 1041

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

that are there at this time.

I'm going to deny the motion to continue. If there is -- we'll start impaneling the jury at 9 tomorrow. If we need to do anything, if we need to address anything else, I'll be here at 8:30 tomorrow. The building I'm told is going to open as early as 8 tomorrow so we can get the jury in and we can get the lawyers in without having to worry about being late as well.

And if anything changes during the course of the day, I know that you all will be in touch with each other and be in touch with me. But here's what I would need. And you can only represent what you get, and I recognize that from the defense standpoint, especially when it is an evolving situation, but the current medical records and/or a physician that is here as well.

This case has been pending. And based upon what is in the medical records at this time, his condition is one that is subject to medication management. And we will have -- all of our people here are trained -- marshals, CSOs alike. And so I think we can manage any situation and we can be able to get this case tried over the course of the next two weeks. And we'll manage the schedule to be able to get that done.

So with that, I'm going to deny the motion without prejudice if anything else changes between now and then as well.

```
Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH
                              Document 233
                                           Filed 11/14/24 Page 19 of 20
                              Pageid#: 1042
                 USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024
 1
              Otherwise, Ms. Peng, on behalf of the government, is
 2
    there anything else we need to address today?
 3
              MS. PENG: Not today, Your Honor. Thank you.
 4
              THE COURT: Mr. Caleb, Mr. Andonian, anything else we
 5
   need to address today?
 6
              MR. ANDONIAN: Nothing else for today, Your Honor.
 7
              THE COURT: I'll be here the rest of the day. I've
 8
   got a hearing at 12, but otherwise I'll be here if we need to
 9
   address anything else.
10
              We'll stand in recess. Thank you.
11
    (Proceedings adjourned, 11:26 a.m.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Case 3:23-cr-00011-RSB-JCH Document 233 Filed 11/14/24 Page 20 of 20 Pageid#: 1043

USA v. Jenkins, 3:23-cr-11, 11/13/2024

CERTIFICATE

I, Lisa M. Blair, RMR/CRR, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings reported by me using the stenotype reporting method in conjunction with computer-aided transcription, and that same is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

/s/ Lisa M. Blair Date: November 14, 2024